

Message

From: Kenneth Portier [kenneth.portier@gmail.com]
Sent: 8/7/2020 6:17:22 PM
To: Wong, Diana [Wong.Diana-M@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Paragraph added back to Executive Summary
Attachments: SACC Asbestos Report Final 08072020.docx

Diana,

I agreed with your change. I took the opportunity to revisit the whole of the Q5 Executive Summary text. I have revised it to more faithfully adhere to the discussion in Q5. The one paragraph that addressed environmental risk characterization was moved to the Q1 executive summary text since it was clearly out of place in Q5. I added a short paragraph to the end of the discussion for Q1.2 placing a reference to the environmental risk discussion that occurs later in Q5.

I also noticed that there were two cross references that had not been fixed, so I fixed those.

Checked table of contents and list of recommendations page numbers just in case my changes moved a section to a different page.

As always, you should call me if you have any questions.

Ken Portier.

On Fri, Aug 7, 2020 at 8:56 AM Wong, Diana <Wong.Diana-M@epa.gov> wrote:

Hello Ken,

After reading response to q. 5.3, and the meeting transcript, I think we should add back the following modified paragraph to the executive summary:

“The Committee concluded that underestimation of risk may be larger than stated. Almost all the existing sources of exposure come from “legacy exposure”; the so called “bystander exposure” is very limited in scope. The Committee has recommended the Agency to include legacy and aggregate asbestos exposure in the calculation of cancer risk for asbestos exposure.”

The paragraph should be after this paragraph:

“Several uncertainties as well as lack of data make it difficult to evaluate the validity of the assessment of exposure and the discussion on confounding presented in the risk characterization section.

Uncertainties with exposure data could be addressed with sensitivity analyses and with collection of more data.”

The language appeared in meeting transcript, and is taken out of the response to question 5.3. Kenny Crump may not want to see it in the executive summary, but that will make a lot of other committee members disagree. Since the recommendation appeared in response to q. 5.1 and 5.3, taking it out will make the summary for question 5 out of context. I have modified the paragraph to soften it, so as to get broader acceptance.

Please let me know what you think, and send me another version with the added paragraph if you agree. Thanks.

Diana